

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 30, 2007, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 25-27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; (2) rejected claims 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; (3) rejected claims 21-27, 29-36, and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e); and (4) rejected claims 28 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants have amended claims 21, 25-27, 30-31, 33, 35, 38, and 41. No new matter has been added. Additionally, Applicants have canceled claims 34 and 40. Applicants submit that claims 21-33, 35-39, and 41 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect.

I. Statement of the Substance of the Interview Conducted October 23, 2007

Participants of the interview included Examiner Swearingen and Applicants' representative Lisa Schoedel. No exhibits were shown nor demonstrations conducted. The participants discussed claim 21 as well as U.S. Patent No. 6,295,502. As a result of the interview, no agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

II. Response to the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 26-27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on the grounds that these claims are indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 26-27 and 31 to clarify that at least one of the locations codes includes a fifth sub-string. Applicants have also amended claim 33 to clarify that each of the sub-strings includes at least one digit. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 26-27, 31, and 33 are definite.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on the grounds that this claim is incomplete for omitting essential steps as "it is unclear what

steps are taken to read the material from the paper map or how the reading is accomplished, as the paper map is not directly connected to the device.” (Office Action, page 3.) Applicants have amended claim 25 to clarify that the location code is printed on a paper map and a user reads the paper map prior to entering the location code into the device. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 25 is complete.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

III. Response to the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the grounds that claims 30-33 are directed to non-functional descriptive matter and claim 34 depends from claim 30. Applicants have amended claim 30 to include the limitations of claim 34 and canceled claim 34. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 30-33 are directed to statutory subject matter.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV. Response to the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 21-27, 29-36, and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,502 (“Hancock”). Applicants have canceled claims 34 and 40 so the rejection of these claims is moot.

In claims 21, 30, 35, 38, and 41, Applicants recite a method or system that includes entering and/or receiving a single location code comprised of at least four sub-strings. The first

sub-string indicates one of a plurality of geographic areas; the second sub-string indicates one of a plurality of categories; the third sub-string indicates one of a plurality of sub-categories of one of the plurality of categories; and the fourth sub-string uniquely indicates a point of interest of a type corresponding to one of the plurality of sub-categories of one of the plurality of categories located in one of the plurality of geographic areas. The single location code is used to retrieve information about a point of interest (e.g., restaurants, hotels, parks).

By using the claimed location code, a user can obtain information about the point of interest “in one step, without the need for browsing through layers of categories to get at the information on a particular POI.” (Applicants’ Specification, paragraph 45 (emphasis added).) For example, “1*3*24*5* is the location code for Marcel Restaurant in Washington, D.C.-1*: Washington; 3*: Restaurant Category; 24*: French Restaurant Sub Category; and 5*: Marcel’s Unique Identifier among all French Restaurants in Washington.” (Applicants’ Specification, paragraph 41.) Thus, the user “may quickly and efficiently access location information based on the location code.” (Applicants’ Specification, paragraph 11.)

Hancock describes two systems for specifying locations: a universal locational address (ULA) and a proprietary locational address (PLA). (Hancock, col. 5, lines 58-61.) “To determine the ULA of a point, a geographic area is divided into several districts.” (Hancock, col. 5, lines 63-64.) Once a district has been selected, a grid system is used to create cells and sub-cells as needed to locate specific locations. (Hancock, col. 6, line 20 to col. 7, line 9.) “The locational address is formed by appending to the district name each sub-cell code in hierarchical progression, moving from lower resolution to more resolution.” (Hancock, col. 7, lines 9-12.) For example, the code .US.GA.ALB.13.78.27.14 refers to a 9 meter area within Albany,

Georgia. (Hancock, col. 14, lines 55-57.) Thus, all of the sub-strings of the ULA indicate only geographic areas, not categories or points of interest.

Hancock's other system uses PLAs. "A PLA is a name chosen to identify a physical structure or location." (Hancock, col. 8, lines 59-60.) For example, Mary Smith may choose MARY.SMITH.HOUSE as the PLA identifying her house. (Hancock, col. 8, lines 65-66.) Another example of a PLA is US.GA.ALB.MACD to refer to a MacDonalds in Albany, Georgia. (Hancock, col. 13, lines 9-10.) The "GA" and "ALB" sub-strings do not indicate a category and a sub-category, respectively, because the claimed fourth sub-string indicates a point of interest of a type corresponding to one of the plurality of sub-categories of one of the plurality of categories. The "GA" and "ALB" sub-strings describe the geographic area of the MacDonalds, not the type of the point of interest (e.g., restaurant, burger). Thus, each of the sub-strings of the PLA indicates only geographic areas and/or points of interest, not categories.

Neither Hancock's ULA sub-strings nor Hancock's PLA sub-strings indicate one of a plurality of categories or one of a plurality of sub-categories of one of the plurality of categories – the second and third sub-strings as claimed. Hancock also does not suggest using category and sub-category sub-strings in a location code. Instead, Hancock describes that "the user can formulate a complex database query by simply picking and choosing among the menu items presented or the user may perform a simple database query by merely inputting one or more common terms." (Hancock, col. 27, lines 63-67.) "[T]he user narrows the subsequent database search by simply selecting one or more appropriate features associated with the selected category." (Hancock, col. 29, lines 34-36.) Thus, Hancock's users need to browse through layers of categories; a process that can be avoided by entering Applicants' single location code.

Because Hancock does not show or suggest entering or receiving a single location code with sub-strings that indicate one of a plurality of categories or one of a plurality of sub-categories of one of the plurality of categories as claimed, Hancock does not show or suggest each and every element of claims 21, 30, 35, 38, and 41. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Hancock does not anticipate these claims.

Claims 22-27 and 29 depend from claim 21. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30. Claim 36 depends from claim 35. Claim 39 depend from claim 38. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that Hancock does not anticipate claims 22-27, 29, 31-33, 36, and 39 for at least the reasons described above with reference to claims 21, 30, 35, and 38.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

V. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 28 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock in view of Official Notice that one skilled in the art “is well aware that some uniform delimiting character must be present throughout a character string in order to parse a variable length string without concatenating the data within.” (Office Action, page 7.) Claim 28 depends from claim 21 and claim 37 depends from claim 35. Thus, this Official Notice does not overcome the deficiencies described with respect to Hancock. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 28 and 37 are not obvious in light of the combination of Hancock and the Examiner’s Official Notice for at least the reasons described above with reference to claims 21 and 35.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Date: October 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Lisa M. Schoedel/
Lisa M. Schoedel
Reg. No. 53,564
Patent Counsel

THE MAP NETWORK, INC.
c/o NAVTEQ North America, LLC
425 West Randolph Street
Chicago, IL 60606
312-894-7351